

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	EB Docket No. 07-147
)	
PENDLETON C. WAUGH, CHARLES M.)	File No. EB-06-IH-2112
AUSTIN, and JAY R. BISHOP)	NAL/Acct. No. 200732080025
)	
PREFERRED COMMUNICATION)	FRN No. 0003769049
SYSTEMS, INC.)	
)	
Licensee of Various Site-by-Site Licenses)	
in the Specialized Mobile Radio Service)	
)	
PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.)	FRN No. 0003786183
)	
Licensee of Various Economic Area Licenses)	
in the 800 MHz Specialized Mobile Radio)	
Services)	

To: The Honorable Judge Arthur I. Steinberg

**RESPONSE TO ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S MOTION TO COMPEL
RE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION FROM
PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.**

Preferred Acquisitions, Inc. ("PAI"), by its attorneys, hereby responds (the "Response") to the Motion to Compel Document Production and Interrogatory Answers from Preferred Acquisitions, Inc. ("Motion to Compel") filed February 19, 2008 by the Enforcement Bureau ("Bureau"), insofar as the Motion to Compel pertains to PAI's document production. PAI is filing a separate response insofar as the Motion to Compel pertains to interrogatory responses.¹ This Response is timely filed, as the parties had agreed to the March 10, 2008 response date. For the reasons set forth herein, the Motion to Compel should be denied.

¹ Under Section 1.323(c) of the Commission's Rules, replies to a response to a motion to compel regarding interrogatories are not permitted. By filing separate responses, one each for document production issues and another for interrogatory response issues, PAI avoids the potential of the Bureau inadvertently running afoul of this rule.

A. Alleged Failure to Identify Which Respondent Produced Each Document

The Bureau complains, among other things, that Charles M. Austin (“Austin”), Preferred Communication Systems, Inc. (“PCSI”) and PAI (Austin, PCSI, and PAI collectively, the “Respondents”), in the course of producing thousands of pages of documents requested by the Bureau, failed to organize those documents “in a manner which would permit the Bureau to distinguish from which party the documents were provided . . .” This complaint is not only without merit, it is frivolous. It is undisputed that PAI is a wholly-owned subsidiary of PCSI. Austin is the controlling owner and president of PCSI. Patently, *all of the documents produced were produced by PCSI*, because PCSI is PAI’s parent and therefore owns all PAI documents, and anything Austin possesses in his capacity as president of PCSI is the property of PCSI, not Austin.

In any event, as Respondents told the Bureau at the time, all of the documents produced were documents in the physical possession of Brown Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered (“BN&K”), from the period of BN&K’s pre-designation representation of PCSI and its subsidiary PAI, and all of the documents were produced *so as to identify the name of the BN&K folder each document was found within*. Thus, for example, the Bureau knew if a particular document had been contained in a “Preferred Communication, Correspondence Vol. 4”, or “Preferred Communication, Crown Castle Correspondence, Vol. 1.” That all documents mentioning PAI had been contained in various BN&K files named “Preferred Communication [this]” or “Preferred Communication [that]”, and not in a file named “Preferred Acquisitions” should have been a hint that all the files were being produced by PCSI, even if it were not otherwise obvious.

This portion of the Motion to Compel therefore should be denied.

B. Documents Already in the Bureau's Possession

At ¶¶ 10-13 of the Motion to Compel, the Bureau purports to rebut PAI's three general claims that the production requests were overbroad and burdensome, that the Bureau already has equal access to certain classes of documents (*i.e.*, documents already at the FCC), and that as to one class of documents, *i.e.*, new documents only created post-designation, any relevant information within them could only be a second-hand summary or analysis of some earlier, pre-designation document.² However, in fact the Bureau's arguments there are devoted entirely to a discussion of why the requested documents are relevant.

PAI *never* interposed any general objection on grounds of relevance – the Bureau's argument is thus totally unresponsive to the three general objections raised by PAI. Apparently, the Bureau has no adequate response to PAI's general objections A-C (*see* n.2, *supra*), and is trying to disguise its lack of an adequate response.

To summarize PAI's earlier filing concerning documents produced pre-designation, PAI objected to producing, again, documents already in the Bureau's possession.³ PAI never claimed that documents already in the Bureau's possession are irrelevant, only that the Bureau does not need additional copies of such documents, and has no right to insist that Respondents, at Respondents' expense, sift through such documents and organize them to simplify the Bureau's trial preparation. Since the Motion to Compel never attempts to explain why PAI is mistaken in objecting on the ground of undue burden, the Bureau is implicitly conceding that such

² PAI's general objections to the Bureau's document production request were set forth in ¶¶ A-C at pages 1-2 of PAI's November 26, 2007 Response to Request for Production of Documents ("PAI Production"), itself reproduced as Attachment C to the Motion to Compel.

³ There were two categories of such documents already in the Bureau's possession: a) documents already produced to the Bureau pre-designation in response to Bureau notices of inquiry; and b) copies of FCC applications and pleadings (including, for example, every rulemaking comment or other filing from any rulemaking proceeding filed by Preferred). *See generally*, PAI Production, ¶¶ A-C at pages 1-2.

duplicative production *is* an undue burden on PAI. Accordingly, to the extent the Motion to Compel seeks production or identification of documents already in the Bureau's possession, it should be denied.

C. Documents Already on File with the FCC

While many FCC filings made by PCSI or PAI over the years (Austin never made any FCC filings in his individual capacity) would be irrelevant, some could be relevant, and Respondents interposed no objection to FCC filings on grounds of relevance. Again, the objection was based on the fact that the documents are already in the FCC's possession, and that requiring Respondents to sort through years of FCC filings, to retrieve from the FCC those filings for which copies were not retained or which were lost in some office move, and then to require Respondents to list and sort those documents so as to shift the burden of preparing the Bureau's case from the Bureau to Respondents, would be unreasonable.

D. Documents Newly Created after the Release of the *HDO* Herein

The allegations in this case all relate to events that occurred prior to the release of the designation order. All relevant facts therefore are going to be determined by reference to documents that were created during (or at least soon after) the events. Any document newly created post-designation is therefore, by definition, either going to be irrelevant, or is going to be an analysis, summary or review of the older documents, or is going to consist of privileged communications from the Respondents to their counsel concerning this case, or is going to consist of counsel's thought processes concerning this case. In no event would there possibly be any legitimate reason to require identification, much less production, of such newly-created documents. PAI objects to either identifying or producing such documents, which obviously continue to be created by the team, as Respondents move to comply with or object to discovery

requests, respond to changes in the marketplace (which does not stand still pending the outcome of this proceeding), and prepare trial (and potentially, settlement) strategy for this proceeding.⁴

The Motion to Compel argues only that post-designation documents could contain relevant information, a point never disputed by Respondents. The Motion to Compel never attempts to rebut Respondents' argument that any relevant information in such newly-created documents would be entirely duplicative of earlier documents, or that almost all of these documents would be protected by attorney-client privilege or attorney work-product doctrine, or that production would be unduly burdensome. Indeed, even identifying and listing these documents could easily turn into a road map for the Bureau to Respondents' trial and settlement strategies.⁵ Therefore, the Motion to Compel should be denied as to this category of documents as well.

E. Objections Based on Overbreadth

The next discussion in the Motion to Compel concerns Respondents' objections based upon overbreadth. However, again, the Bureau's arguments are a *non sequitur*.

⁴ Respondents and their counsel exchange multiple e-mails virtually every day, and the Bureau is demanding that Respondents produce or identify each and every one, as it is circulated, on an ongoing basis.

⁵ The Bureau argues, Motion to Compel at ¶ 14, that Respondents should be required to create and turn over a log identifying each post-designation document as to which privilege or work-product doctrine is claimed. However, since the Bureau never tries to rebut Respondents' argument that any information in newly-created documents would necessarily be duplicative (and second-hand) compared to the pre-designation documents which would necessarily have to have served as the information source, the Bureau has failed to reach the threshold for demanding identification of post-designation documents.

The Bureau must first demonstrate some need for a class of documents, before the issue of confidentiality/privilege can arise. Having failed to demonstrate any need for this class of documents, the Bureau has no right to know which ones are subject to a claim of confidentiality or privilege, or to have them each identified by title, subject, author, recipient(s), date, etc., which listing itself would necessarily divulge trial strategies and thought processes.

The Bureau stipulated that voluntary production of documents in BN&K's possession, and stemming from BN&K's representation of PCSI and PAI during the period 1998-2004 (*i.e.*, prior to PCSI moving the representation over to the Patton Boggs law firm in 2004, but manifestly during the time frame deemed relevant to the Bureau), including documents which were confidential or privileged, would NOT constitute a waiver of any claim of confidentiality or privilege respecting any document created post-*HDO*⁶ when undersigned counsel (David Kaufman) was hired anew to represent Respondents in this proceeding.⁷ Thereafter, in reliance on that stipulation, except for documents already produced to the Bureau pre-designation and publicly-available FCC filings, every single document in BN&K's possession from that prior representation was produced.

This document production amounted to thousands of pages. Not a single document from this prior BN&K representation was withheld on the grounds of privilege, confidentiality, irrelevance, overbreadth or undue burden, as the PAI Production made clear.⁸ Nothing, other than the three above-discussed categories (*i.e.*, produced to the Bureau pre-*HDO*, already publicly available in the FCC's files, or newly created post-*HDO*) was held back, so there was nothing to identify.

To the extent the Bureau is demanding that Respondents identify and list every such previously-produced document, every single FCC filing ever made, and every document newly created post-*HDO*, for the reasons set forth in Parts B-D of this Response, *supra*, such a demand remains totally unreasonable and unduly burdensome, and should be denied.

⁶ "HDO" refers to the Hearing Designation Order in this proceeding, FCC 07-125, released July 20, 2007.

⁷ A copy of this Stipulation, made via e-mail exchange, is attached hereto as Appendix A.

⁸ The Bureau cast a very wide net in the way that it drafted its requests for production, and the Bureau came back with a very full net of documents.

F. Documents That Pendleton C. Waugh Executed on Behalf of PAI

The Motion to Compel, ¶ 14, complains about PAI's failure to produce all documents which Pendleton C. Waugh ("Waugh") executed on behalf of PAI, as the Bureau requested in its document production request #2. (That production request sought "All Documents that Pendleton C. Waugh signed or executed on behalf of PAI.") In the PAI Production, at page 3, PAI explained: "Waugh never signed any binding instrument on behalf of PAI." This was not an objection by PAI – it was an unqualified statement that no such documents ever existed.

The Bureau may be frustrated that a particular type of document does not exist, but that is not grounds for filing a Motion to Compel.

G. Federal Income Tax Returns

The next focus of the Motion to Compel, at ¶¶ 15-19, is upon PAI having declined to produce its federal income tax returns, in response to Bureau production request # 12. However, PAI never objected to producing federal income tax returns! Rather, the PAI Production, at page 5, explained: "There are no such documents; PAI is a wholly-owned subsidiary of PCSI." As is the case with Part F, *supra*, this was not an objection by PAI – it was an unqualified statement that no such documents ever existed. Again, the Bureau may be frustrated that a particular type of document does not exist, but that is not grounds for filing a Motion to Compel.

Conclusion

In demanding that the Respondents organize and sort documents for the Bureau, that the Respondents re-produce documents already delivered to the Bureau or publicly available in the FCC's own files, and that Respondents separately identify each and every e-mail, letter, etc., as it is being produced post-designation, the Bureau is engaged in an effort to wear down Respondents via attrition, not to find relevant documents. In seeking to compel the production of

documents where no objection was interposed but where PAI said under penalty of perjury that no such documents exist, the Motion to Compel is frivolous. Therefore, PAI asks the Presiding Judge to deny the Motion to Compel in its entirety, with respect to the issue of document production.

Respectfully submitted,
PREFERRED COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS, INC.

By: 
Robert J. Keller

By: 
David J. Kaufman

Law Offices of Robert J. Keller, P.C.
P.O. Box 33428
Washington, DC 20033-0428
Tel. 202-223-2100
e-mail: rjk@telcomlaw.com

Rini Coran, PC
1615 L Street NW, Suite 1325
Washington, DC 20036
Tel. 202-955-5516
e-mail: dkaufman@rinicoran.com

March 6, 2008

**Response to
Bureau Motion to Compel
Appendix A**

**Stipulation Regarding Documents from
Prior Representation, 1998-2004, by
Brown Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered**

David Kaufman

From: Anjali Singh [Anjali.Singh@fcc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2007 2:32 PM
To: David Kaufman
Cc: Bob Keller; PreComSys@aol.com; Gary Schonman; Gary Oshinsky
Subject: RE: Preferred Case; Document Requests

David:

The Bureau agrees to your proposed stipulation and limited waiver of privilege, provided that the Bureau retains the ability to object if it believes that any asserted privilege(s) should not apply to any potentially responsive documents from your firm's 2007 representation of PCSI, PAI, and Mr. Austin.

Thank you.

Anjali Singh
Federal Communications Commission
Enforcement Bureau
Investigations and Hearings Division
445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-A331
Washington, DC 20554
202-418-2529

*** Non-Public: For Internal Use Only ***

From: David J. Kaufman [mailto:david@bnkcomlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2007 4:40 PM
To: Anjali Singh; Gary Oshinsky
Cc: 'Bob Keller'; PreComSys@aol.com
Subject: Preferred Case; Document Requests

Anjali/Gary:

I tried to reach you by phone, but then remembered this is a federal holiday. The rest of us are working.

Anyway, Brown Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered ("BN&K") has, as you, been retained post-designation to represent Preferred and Mr. Austin. BN&K also represented Preferred during the period 1998-2004, before the business went over to Patton Boggs. BN&K has in its possession numerous documents from the period 1998-2004 responsive to the Bureau's document production requests.

Obviously, these documents contain significant amounts of attorney work product. They pertain to the time frame in which you seem to be most interested. The three Respondents which we represent have told me they would like for these materials to be made available to the Bureau, if doing so was not deemed to constitute a waiver of either privilege or work product with respect to anything since BN&K was retained anew in late 2007. BN&K is of the same frame of mind.

After all, it is mere coincidence that BN&K is the same law firm hired separately now, as the law firm that was engaged in representation at the time of the 800 MHz SMR auction in which PAI participated.

We would like to discuss some sort of stipulation to the effect that production of materials from the first representation is not and will not be treated as a waiver with respect to the current representation.

Please let us know when you return to the office.

Thanks.

3/6/2008

David J. Kaufman
Brown Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered
1301 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 450
Washington, DC 20036
202-887-0600 tel.
202-223-8685 fax

This message is for the named recipient(s) only, and contains material which may be confidential or privileged. If this message has reached you in error, please delete it without further distribution.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Steve Denison, a paralegal at the law firm of Rini Coran, PC, hereby certify that I have caused a copy of the foregoing **“RESPONSE TO ENFORCEMENT BUREAU’S MOTION TO COMPEL RE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION FROM PREFERRED ACQUISITIONS, INC.”** to be sent by electronic mail, this 6th day of March, 2008, to the following:

Hon. Arthur I. Steinberg
Administrative Law Judge
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., Room 1-C861
Washington, D.C. 20554
Arthur.steinberg@fcc.gov

Mr. William D. Silva
Law Offices of William D. Silva
5335 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20015-2003
bill@luselaw.com

Mr. Jay R Bishop
1190 S. Farrell Drive
Palm Springs, CA 92264
jaybishopps@aol.com

Gary A. Oshinsky, Attorney
Anjali K. Singh, Attorney
Enforcement Bureau
Investigations and Hearing Division
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., Room 4-C330
Washington, D.C. 20554
Gary.oshinsky@fcc.gov
Anjali.singh@fcc.gov



Steve Denison